DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 719 FL 014 575

AUTHOR Houlton, David; King, Edith W.
TITLE Mother Tongue Teaching in Britain and the United States: Some Current Developments.
PUB DATE May 84
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at a Global Crossroads Conference (Washington, DC, May 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Students; Comparative Analysis; Cultural Pluralism; Educational Philosophy; Educational Trends; *Federal Programs; Foreign Countries; *Immigrants; Instructional Materials; *Limited English Speaking; Material Development; Minority Groups; *Multicultural Education; Multicultural Textbooks; Multilingual Materials; *Native Language Instruction; Publications
IDENTIFIERS Great Britain; United States

ABSTRACT

Recent developments and trends in the field of native language instruction among language minority groups in Britain and the United States support the growing attitude that a multicultural curriculum reflecting children's cultural experiences is appropriate, and the development of multilingual materials and classroom strategies has taken priority. In Britain this has taken the form of a national effort, called the Mother Tongue Project, including research on the linguistic diversity of local communities and support for primary curriculum development. Instructional and supporting materials were developed from this initiative. In the United States the initiatives have taken the form of a federal bilingual education program, with controversy focusing on both cost and program direction. A variety of materials and programs have been developed within this national trend, with varying results. In Britain, arguments are strong for supporting children's bilingualism. In the United States, school districts confronted with growing immigrant populations are seeking a middle ground between native and English language emphasis. What are clearly needed are further research, curricular materials, and teacher education. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED248719

Title: Mother Tongue Teaching in Britain and the United States: some current developments

Authors: David Houlton, Director, Mother Tongue Project, London
Edith W King, Professor, University of Denver, Colorado

Abstract: This article discusses some current developments in mother tongue teaching in the schools of Britain and the United States. British approaches to bilingual education, curricular materials and teaching methods are highlighted in the description of the Mother Tongue Project. Comparisons with American projects and studies are made. The controversy surrounding mother tongue teaching in both nations is considered.

FL 014 575

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David Houlton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Title: Mother Tongue Teaching in Britain and the United States:

some current developments

Views from Britain and the United States

Authors: David Houlton, Director, Mother Tongue Project, London

Edith W King, Professor, University of Denver, Colorado

In a special, Fall 1983 education supplement of the New York Times Gene Maeroff talks about a "rising immigration tide" which "strains the nation's schools". He goes on to point out that America's classrooms are currently confronted by the biggest influx of immigrant students since early in he century. So, as in previous periods of American history, elementary and secondary schools are being turned into "melting pots" as they work to absorb the meny thousands of new immigrants. (Maeroff, N.Y. Times, August 21, 1983, Education Supplement, p.1.)

The situation in American schools in the 1980s parallels the experiences of British schools in the 1960s. The sudden influx of non-English speaking children in large numbers taxes

the resources of the educational enterprise dedicated to the promulgation of the English language as well as the culture, heritage, history, tradition and customs embedded in that language. And educators know that the task of helping fit these youngsters into the society falls primarily on the nation's schools. As Maeroff puts it "the implications of having to absorb both immigrant and native-born students with limited English proficiency are enormous - affecting curriculum, costs, the availability of teaching jobs, and educational and social philosophy". (p. 37) A statement as applicable to British schools as those in America.

Traditionally in schools on both sides of the Atlantic, children speaking a language other than English were seen as struggling against an impediment that needed to be eradicated before they could successfully acquire the English language and thus take advantage of the learning opportunities available. But it has been interesting to note how in more recent years a shift in thinking has been underway as more educators have come to see the pupil's mother tongue not as a barrier to learning English but as a valuable foundation experience of using language and understanding of how language works.

Today the arguments for a multicultural curriculum reflecting children's cultural experiences are gaining ground in the United States and in Britain. But language and culture are inseparable as teachers have discovered through their efforts to incorporate aspects of their pupils' home cultures into the day to day work of the classroom. Gradually, then, they are recognizing that the multicultural curriculum should also be a multilingual one, and the development of appropriate classroom strategies is becoming a major priority.

In responding to the needs of ethnic minority children schools have realized that they are also becoming closely involved with the children's parents, families and communities. If there is any doubt about the views of minority parents toward mother tongue maintenance for their children, evidence of their commitment is to be found in the community-run mother tongue classes operating outside normal school hours in many parts of the United States and Britain. It is evident that many parents are deeply concerned with sustaining the mother tongue in order to facilitate communication with their children and to encourage participation and communication at family gatherings. Further, many wish their children to be able to keep in contact with the homeland and with relatives and friends who reside there.

Parents of ethnic minority children are often worried about the loss of self esteem and identification with the traditions and culture of their ethnic group: a situation which no doubt is exacerbated in both Britain and the United States by the fact that few minority cultures and languages are publicly recognized and valued in the wider society.

To underscore the importance of the maintenance of the mother tongue, Verity Khan writes:

> The fact that many children of non-English mother tongues.... stop speaking (and at times refuse to acknowledge the existence of) their mother tongue is not solely and simply an indication of dramatic language shift. It also indicates their appreciation of the relative value accorded to the two languages in the school and the wider society as a whole. In some cases minority children refuse to speak the mother tongue at home

except when essential, for example, with a non-English-speaking parent. This situation and the actual dominance of English and loss of mother tongue can cause the loss of total communication between parents and children in minority families even before the child starts school.

(Khan, 1980, p.83-84)

Her statement reflects the deep concern of educators in English speaking nations about the non-English speaking children in their schools.

A Response to Mother Tongue Teaching in Britain

In Britain one of the manifestations of this concern has been a recognition that the education service needs to have access to accurate information on the scale of linguistic diversity, as well as some picture of the patterns of language use, among children. Here, the London area has been well-documented, generally through the pioneering work of Rosen and Burgess (Rosen and Burgess 1980) and specifically in the Inner London Education through the Authority's own biennial Language Census, the 1983 version of which (I.L.E.A. 1983) revealed 147 languages spoken by school-age children. In Local Education Authorities (LEAs) elsewhere the Linguistic Minorities Project[1] has made an important contribution not simply in terms of increasing the data available on the range of languages used by children but by providing carefully-evaluated survey instruments which can be used by Authorities themselves as part of their monitoring procedures.

A further manifestation came in 1981 when the Schools Council[2], with support from the Inner London and Haringey Education Authorities, and funding from the European Commission, felt the climate was right to launch a major national project which would offer assistance, in the form of resources and guidelines, to Primary teachers wishing to extend the mother tongue skills of their primary age children[3]. There had been other curriculum development projects in the field. Some looked at how schools could support the bilingualism of Welsh-speaking children. Others, such as the Bradford Mother Tongue and English Teaching Project[4] and the Bedfordshire/EC Mother Tongue Project[5] focussed on ethnic minority pupils from specific language groups living in particular areas of Britain. The Schools Council Project, however, was to be the first national initiative.

From the outset it was clear that the Project could not focus its efforts on any single category of teachers since there are three broad groups who share responsibility for the education of bilingual children. The first comprises those teachers who contribute their time and expertise, often voluntarily, to the community mother tongue schools that meet at evenings and weekends. The second is the steadily growing group employed by Local Education Authorities as mother tongue teaching specialists in mainstream primary schools. The third, and numerically the largest, consists of all those primary teachers whose work brings them into regular contact with pupils from different linguistic backgrounds and who therefore exert some influence on how children perceive their bilingualism, and the status that is ascribed to their language within the school. Three groups of teachers, often from different professional backgrounds, facing varied teaching situations and classroom priorities, yet all having complementary roles in aiding children's mother tongue development. The Project set itself the task of collaborating with all

three groups in order to devise resources and teaching strategies which would meet their needs and circumstances.

Bengali and Greek were taken as the focus languages for the Project's main material output. Chosen because of the size of their populations in the London area where the project is based[6], these also offered interesting linguistic contrasts and similarities which enabled the experience of working with them to be more widely generalisable to other community languages Indeed a major aim was to extend the process of materials development in Bengali and Greek so as to provide a framework which would assist bilingual teachers generally in preparing their own materials for classroom use.

September 1981 to July 1982 was a development period during which the project team worked closely with groups of Bengali and Greek-speaking teachers in order to produce a collection of oracy and literacy materials reflecting the experience of children growing up in an urban multicultural environment.

The following school year saw draft versions of the materials[7] undergoing classroom trials in the London area, the bilingual teachers using them being, in the main, those who were previously involved in their development. Although primarily intended for evaluating the materials in use, this trial year had the additional aim of providing the team with insight into other aspects of mother tongue teaching such as, how schools can organize, how children are likely to benefit, and what sort of in-service support needs to be available for all numbers of staff[8].

Although Bengali and Greek have considerable statistical importance in the London area where the project was based, at a national level they are just two among several major community languages and, by comparison with others, in certain areas of Britain they are spoken by only a small proportion of the ethnic minority population. It became all the more important, then, that bilingual teachers of other languages should be able to draw upon the project's work and feel that its materials package has some applications in their own spheres of interest.

This became known as the 'transferability' aspect of the project. It was approached in a variety of ways. One starting point was to incorporate an element of intercultural exchange into the Bengali and Greek strands, thus enabling a young Greek-speaker, for instance, to read a story in Greek about a Bangladeshi child's first day at school in a new country, or by giving a Bengali-speaking child a chance to learn about a Cypriot wedding ceremony. A further step was for the project team to make some of their materials available to bilingual teachers of other languages, Portuguese and Urdu for instance, who used them in their own classes having carried out any necessary translation. Later, details of how they used and adapted the materials were collated by the project team and, together with the results of monitoring the original development process, formed the basis for a handbook of guidelines on preparing resources for mother tongue teaching at the primary level.

Supporting the Teacher in the Multilingual Classroom

Classroom teachers in multicultural primary schools face a wide variety of situations. Many work with children from a range of linguistic backgrounds. Others draw their pupils

from communities where a particular language is in the majority. Some teach classes in which ethnic minority children are in a distinct minority.

Although this makes for a heterogeneous group, the project found that what these teachers have in common is that they are likely to have little, if any, competence in the languages of their pupils and therefore need guidance on how to bring language diversity on to the classroom agenda. Here, three publications were produced by the project:

The first - Supporting Children's Bilingualism[9] was the outcome of a seminar held by the project in the Summer of 1982. It sets out some of the issues which schools and LEAs will need to examine in order to provide teachers with the supportive structure that is necessary if they are to be able to respond effectively to their pupils' languages. Included are sections on - Why support children's bilingualism; The ne for a school and LEA policy; In-service training; Resources; Links with ethnic minority communities. A final section poses some discussion points and offers suggestions on how the document could be used locally as an aid to in-service training, or in preparing school or LEA policies.

The second - All Our Languages[10] - is the main handbook for teachers in linguistically mixed classrooms. It is a compilation of activities undertaken by primary teachers in eleven LEAs between January 1982 and January 1983. Throughout the book the emphasis is on self-help with the intention being to demonstrate how teachers can create a classroom atmosphere of linguistic awareness and sharing, calling upon the range of human and material resources that are available to most multicultural schools. The main sections are - Finding out about children's languages; Language diversity across the

curriculum; Working with parents; Using mother tongue stories; Learning children's languages; Looking at resources.

The third - The Children's Language Project[11] - comprises a series of activity cards that are the outcome of a joint venture involving the Mother Tongue Project and the Language Information Network Co-Ordination[12]. They are designed to encourage children to investigate their own patterns of language use as well as the languages they encounter all around them at school, at home and in the community.

There are four cards in the series, each with a specific theme - Languages at home; Languages at school; Languages in the neighbourhood; Languages near and far.

Responses in the United States to Mother Tongue Teaching

The situation in the United States is not unlike the one described in Britain in that there have been a number of major curriculum development initiatives working along similar lines to the Mother Tongue Project. But in recent years probably the most striking and visible response to linguistic diversity in schools has been the Lau vs Nichols decision of the Supreme Court in 1974 and its ramifications. This landmark decision, as yet unparalleled in Britain, stated that services and treatment in education are not equal merely because all students are provided with the same facilities, books, teachers and curriculum. The Supreme Court's pronouncement points out that "students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education". As a result of this decision every local school district with non-English speaking pupils is now obliged to provide bilingual education. So by 1977 there were actually 425 funded

bilingual projects in sixty-eight languages and dialects mainly supported by the Bilingual Education Act. However, it is to be noted that 80 percent of these projects were in Spanish. (Epstein, 1977)

The Lau decision led to the delineation of Lau Remedies which outlined programme content for bilingual education. The Lau Remedies were devised by the former Office of Education (now the Department of Education) to correct past school practices that were seen as detrimental to non-English speaking children. Where bilingual education becomes strongly intertwined with multi-ethnic education and the teaching of cultural pluralism is in the educational practices of maintenance of the mother tongue and culture of the child. Noel Epstein has labelled this the philosophy of advocating "affirmative ethnicity". He points out that the issue is not whether one favours promoting pluralism and ethnic diversity in American schools, but who will pay for this pluralism, how will the money be distributed and what public status will be given to other languages and their attendant cultures. He writes:

> The issue is not the right or desirability of groups to maintain their languages and cultures. The issue is the government's role. The overriding question is whether the federal government is responsible for financing and promoting students' attachments to their ethnic languages and cultures.
>
> (Epstein, 1977, p.20)

The current status of bilingual/bicultural education in the United States seems to be one of political and financial confusion. Policies at the local school district level for handling influxes of non-English speaking children are ambivalent and indecisive. For example, while one school official states that "students have to learn in their own language before we can teach them in English", another school administrator says that "our greatest concern is the lack of trained translators who can assist the teachers".

When the Department of Education took up the tasks of setting forth the federal regulations in bilingual education, the controversy raged anew. Public hearings held across the nation in the Fall of 1980 on the new regulations for bilingual education brought cries of increased costs for local and state agencies and sustained objections to the policies and the philosophy of Department of Education officials. Resolution of the controversies or a sense of direction for bilingual education seems yet a long way off in the United States.

In 1981, American educators faced the effective demise of the ethnic Heritage Studies Act under the Reagan Administration's policies of shunting federal funds to the states through "block" grants. Response by the states to the needs of ethnically diverse, non-English speaking children have been mixed and muddled. For example, one state legislature - Colorado - has drafted and passed an act called the English Language Proficiency Act (ELPA). The purpose of this act is to provide for the establishment of an English language proficiency programme in public schools where children have been identified by the Lau categories as in need of English language training and proficiency. The English Language Proficiency Act funds programmes in schools if the school district

will survey its children and "identify through observation and recommendation of parents, teachers and other persons, students whose dominant language may not be English".

But all students who have the potential of being A, B, or C classification under the Lau categories must have documented support before being certified for funding.

The Asian and Minority Group Project of California

What approaches are being used in American schools to educate non-English speaking children? A publication by the Office of Bilingual, Bicultural Education, California State Department of Education, delineates four such approaches:

1) submersion classes;
2) grammar-based ESL; (English as a second language)
3) communicative-based ESL;
4) sheltered English classes.

A brief description of these four approaches is as follows:

Submersion classes are situations in which teachers speak in a native-speaker to native-speaker register as if all the students in the class were native speakers of English.

Grammar-based ESL classes focus on phonology and syntax and emphasize learning language rules through inductive (grammar-translation) or deductive (audiolingual code) methods.

Communicative-based ESL, by contrast, places emphasis on language use and functions. This type of instruction focuses on basic communicative competence, rather than learning grammar rules.

Sheltered English approaches deliver subject matter in the second language. In these situations learners of English as a second language are usually grouped together, special materials are provided, pupils are allowed to speak in their native language and a native speaker-to-non-native speaker register is used by the teacher.

The research suggests that communicative-based ESL and sheltered English instruction effectively promote the acquisition of basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) in English. Grammar-based ESL and submersion classes have been found to be less effective in promoting such skills. (Cummins, Krashen and Terrell in Handbook for Teaching Vietnamese Speaking Students, p.35-36, 1983).

The material quoted above was excerpted from the Handbook for Teaching Vietnamese Children. This is one of the series of handbooks published in 1983 by the California State Department of Education to meet the needs of the rapidly increasing minority language population in the state. The handbooks focus on various language groups including: Vietnamese, Cantonese, Korean, Philipino, Mandarin, Japanese, Portuguese, Ilocano Punjabi, Armenian, Laotian, Cambodian, and Samoan. Each handbook addresses the

unique historical, socio-cultural and linguistic characteristics of each language group. The handbooks also provide educational resources such as community organisations and classroom instructional materials. They are designed to assist bilingual/ESL teachers, counsellors, school administrators and teacher training institutions in establishing programmatic, curricular and instructional policies.

The linguists who developed the theoretical bases for the minority language instruction programmes set forth in Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework, advocate additive bilingualism and stress on maintenance of the mother tongue.

Writing in the Handbook for Teaching Vietnamese Students, they state that opportunities to develop cognitive and academic language skills in Vietnamese are naturally not available to students in most communities in California, therefore parents and educators must work together to design and implement such opportunities. Further, cognitive and academic language skills not learned in Vietnamese can easily be added in English by specially designed instruction at school. "If students are to benefit from their bilingualism, attention to Vietnamese language development and English language acquisition is necessary." (p.42. Office of Biling./Bicult. Educ., Calif. State Dept. of Educ. Sacramento, CA.) Hence, we can recognize a similarity in philosophy, goals and theoretical framework between the Mother Tongue Project in Britain and the programmes for Asian language speakers in California just described.

Yet despite the achievement of the Mother Tongue Project in Britain, and similar projects in the United States, many observers would maintain that the circumstances on both sides of the Atlantic of defining a unified policy for mother tongue teaching become more and more problematical. What do educators propose? What do parents want? What will the Federal, State or Local Authorities fund?

A study of Southeast Asian refugee parents in the Pacific Northwest sheds further light on the mother tongue teaching controversy. Mary Blakely of the College of Education, University of Oregon, interviewed Southeast Asian refugee parents to obtain their perspectives on formal education for their children attending the local schools. She further augmented her interpretation of the survey data with two prior years of participant observation fieldwork in the setting. The main purpose of her project was to help the school district learn more about how the refugee families adjusted to American schools. Emphasis in the study was placed on the parents' perception of the language environment in the school, cross-cultural communication, parent involvement in schools and bilingualism. Refugee groups included Chinese, Vietnamese, Lao, Mien and Khmer speakers.

This Oregon school district had no recent experience with bilingual education prior to the refugee programme. After the arrival of the families from Southeast Asia, the school district applied for and received Federal funds to implement a "transitional bilingual" programme in the schools for the children of these families. The objective was to promote a "language shift" from mother tongue to the dominant languages of the local

society. The programme and the students were evaluated only on the basis of English language proficiency, not on achievement of native language literacy skills. (Blakely, 1983)

After two years of the programme Blakely asked parents if they thought their children should learn to read and write their native languages as well as English. The refugee parents across language groups generally gave one answer for their older children and another for the younger primary school age children. Blakely reports that half the parents noted that older children already were literate, so there was no need for them to receive native language instruction at school. The majority (60 percent) said they wanted their younger children to learn to read and write the native language. One Chinese-Vietnamese mother stated "I would like the school to open a Chinese class. It would be good for all chidren. The Americans, too". This mother noted that in our contemporary world Chinese might be a more widely used language than Vietnamese. Chinese parents also mentioned the intellectual value of becoming literate in two languages.

However, a Lao-speaking father was most adamant in his response in opposition to native language teaching. Through an interpreter he stated:

> Write down that I want only English at school! This is not Laos. There is no reason to learn to read Lao here. There are no Lao books in America. Here my boys need English. They are learning English well at school and I am happy. To get a good job they must know how to read and write English.
>
> (Blakely, p.62)

Blakely concluded that no parents surveyed argued against English literacy for their children, but some parents doubted the value of being literate in an additional language. Like immigrant groups before them in America they recognized the immediate needs for English language proficiency. (Blakely, 1983)

These attitudes were further confirmed during an interview with the ESL Consultant for the Aurora Colorado Schools, who described his school district's programme for Korean-speaking new immigrant children. He stressed that families from Korea wanted an "American education" for their children. Parents wanted their children to be immersed in the American tradition and speak only American English. Yet he noted that ten or fifteen years later, when the families had been in the U.S. for a while, they spoke of feelings of regret for not teaching their children about their Korean heritage and language, as they and their children soon forgot the traditions and culture of the mother country.

Similar responses have been reported by teachers and writers in Britain. The Mother Tongue Project, for instance, encountered a number of primary teachers whose initiatives in promoting the mother tongue had been discouraged by ethnic minority parents who were unconvinced of their educational value. The project also came across bilingual parents who had consciously set out to raise their children as monoglot English speakers, believing this to be the way to educational success, only later to discover that the children had a confused sense of cultural identity and felt themselves to be lacking an understanding of their community's heritage.

Just how widespread this ambivalence is among ethnic minority parents would be difficult to ascertain, but it is interesting that Jenny Wilding, in her study of parental attitudes (Wilding 1981), felt it important to note that some parents, despite principled commitment to mother tongue teaching were anxious for reassurance that their children's English would not suffer as a result.

Another argument that confounds the issue of mother tongue teaching in both countries is the one of ethnic minority isolation, and hence discrimination and economic disadvantage. In Britain the anti-racist education journal Issues has warned of ethnic minority children becoming "ghettoised" through mother tongue teaching programmes that are isolated from the mainstream curriculum and restricted to only a particular section of pupils. In the United States, writing in an issue of the Harvard Education Review on the bilingual education controversy, and particularly how it affects Spanish speakers, Ortheguy points out that to the extent that bilingual programmes help maintain communication in Spanish among Hispanic children, they may also curb the process of assimilation by identifying Hispanics as a distinct group. "Conventional wisdom holds that as long as a group remains distinguished from the larger society, its members will remain poor. Because of their experience with racism in this country, many Hispanics have long ago given up the hope of disappearing as a distinct group." (Ortheguy, 1982 p.312)

Whither Mother Tongue Teaching?

Where does this leave us in this discussion of developments in mother tongue teaching in Britain and the United States? Strong arguments are set forth by the Mother Tongue Project for supporting children's bilingualism. It points out that bilingualism can benefit

all children by supporting confidence in one's own language repertoire, increasing language awareness, and awareness of cultural diversity, combating racism and increasing communication between different cultural groups. Bilingualism can benefit bilingual chidlren by supporting learning, aiding intellectual and cognitive development, supporting self-esteem and confidence in one's own ethnicity, supporting the relationship with one's family and ethnic community and extending vocational and life options. (Houlton and Willey, 1983)

Bilingualism can benefit teachers and the schools by increasing their knowledge of and relationships with individual pupils, by recognizing pupils' families and communities as school resources, by increasing teachers' awareness of linguistic and cultural diversity, strengthening school/community ties and by contributing to the multicultural ethos of the school. Finally bilingualism and the inclusion of mother tongue teaching can promote equality of educational opportunity, and develop the skills and talents that children bring to school. Bilingualism is a positive response to a multiethnic society. (Houlton and Willey)

In America in 1983, school districts across the country, confronted with growing immigrant populations of limited English-speaking students are opting for a middle ground, allowing students to retain literacy in their native language while helping them to learn English. Some school administrators are recognizing the advantages of bilingualism or multilingualism for all students, native North Americans as well as new immigrants. But the debate continues:

> The question of whether to encourage students to perpetuate fluency in their native tongue has thrust the schools into a larger debate over the future of the United States as a monolingual society. Critics charge that the dominance of English could be weakened and national cohesiveness could be threatened if educators do not handle this issue carefully.
>
> (Maeroff, 1983 p.67)

What is evident, however, is the need for more research, curricular materials and teacher education.

Notes

1. The Linguistic Minorities Project was based at the London University Institute of Education between 1980 and 1983. A report of its work is published by Tinga Tinga Ltd, a branch of Heinemann U.K.

2. The Schools Council was disbanded in March 1984 and replaced by the School Curriculum Development Committee (SCDC) which is based at Newcombe House, 45 Notting Hill Gate, London W11 3JB.

3. The Mother Tongue Project came into being in May 1981 and will run until August 1985. It can be contacted at:

The Centre for Education in a Multi-Ethnic Society (CEMES)

Robert Montefiore School

Underwood Road

London E1 5AD

After August 1985 information about the project can be obtained from the SCDC (Information Section) at the address above (2).

4. The Mother Tongue and English Teaching Project was based at Bradford College between 1979 and 1981. Information about it can be obtained from Bradford College, Bradford, West Yorkshire.

5. The Bedfordshire/EEC Mother Tongue and Culture Project took place in the Bedfordshire LEA between 1976 and 1980.

6. Bengali, is now by far the largest community language other than English in the Inner London Education Authority. According to the 1983 Language Census it is spoken by over 9000 children in the Authority's schools, mainly in the Tower Hamlets area of east London. There are 31 primary schools where more than 30% of the pupils on roll are Bengali-speaking and in six of these over 80% are Bengali speakers. Greek is the fifth largest language in the ILEA, spoken by over 3000 children. But in the London borough of Haringey it has significantly more speakers than any other language apart from English, being spoken by 2500 children, which is approximately 10% of the borough's school population.

7. Details of the project's Bengali and Greek materials are available from the Mother Tongue Project at the address above (3).

8. A full report of the Mother Tongue Project will be published by NFER/Nelson in 1985/86 under the title: Community Languages in the Primary School.

9. Supporting Children's Bilingualism, by David Houlton and Richard Willey. Published by Longman Resources Unit, 33-35 Tanner Row, York.

10. All Our Languages, by David Houlton. Published by Edward Arnold Ltd, London.

11. The Children's Language Project, published by Philip and Tacey Ltd, Andover, Hampshire.

12. The Language Information Network Co-ordination was set up to disseminate the findings and work of the Linguistic Minorities Project. It ran between May 1981 and December 1984. Information about it can be obtained from the Information Unit, London University Institute of Education, Bedford Way, London WC1.

REFERENCES

Banks, James. (1981) Multiethnic Education: Theory and Practice. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Blakely, Mary. (1983) Southeast Asian Refugee Parents: An Inquiry Into Home-School Communication and Understanding. Anthropology and Education (Vol. 14, No. 1, Spring, 1383.) pp. 43-68.

Brown, Daphne. (1979) Mother Tongue to English. London: Cambridge University Press.

California State Dept. of Educ. Office of Bilingual, Bicultural Education. (1981) Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework. Sacramento, California.

Cummins, J., Krashen, D., and Terrell, T. (1983) A Handbook for Teaching Vietnamese Speaking Students. Sacramento, California.

Cummins, K., Krashen, D., and Terrell, T. (1983) A Handbook for Teaching Korean-Speaking Students. Sacramento, California.

Cummins, James. (1981) The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students. Schooling and Language Minority Students: Los Angeles, Calif. Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State Univ. Los Angeles.

Epstein, Noel. (1977) Language, Ethnicity and the Schools. Washington, D.C. Institute for Educational Leadership, George Washington University.

Fisherman, Joshua. (1976) Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.

Garcia, Ricardo. (1982) Teaching in a Pluralistic Society. New York: Harper and Row.

Golden, John. (1983) Interview with ESL Consultant Aurora, Colorado Public Schools, Aurora, Colorado.

Gollnick, D., and Chinn, P. (1983) Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society. St. Louis, Mosby Publ. Co.

Houlton, David. (1983) Schools Council Mother Tongue Project. Multicultural Teaching for Practitioners in School and Community. (Volume 1, No. 3, Summer, 1983 pp. 23-26.) Stoke-on-Trent. Trentham Books.

Houlton, David and Willey, Richard. (1983) Supporting Children's Bilingualism. Longman Resources Unit, York. U.K.

I.L.E.A. (1983) The 1983 Language Census, Report by the Education Officer to ILEA Education Committee, Schools Sub-committee.

Issues in Race and Education. (1982) Mother Tongue: Politics and Practice. No. 35, Spring 1982, London.

Khan, Verity S. (1980) The Mother Tongue of Linguistic Minorities in Multicultural England. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development. (Vol., No., pp.71-88.)

King, Edith. (1980) Teaching Ethnic Awareness. Methods and Materials for the Elementary School. Glenview, Ill. Good Year Books.

Krashen, Stephen D. (1981) Bilingual Education and Second Language Acquisition Theory. Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework. Los Angeles, California Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Maeroff, Gene. (1983) Rising Immigration Tide Strains Nation's Schools. New York Times Education Summer Survey (Section 12, August 21, 1983.) New York, New York Times.

Ortheguy, Ricardo. (1982) Thinking about Bilingual Education: A Critical Appraisal. Harvard Educational Review. (Vol. 52, No. 3, August, 1982 pp. 301-314.) Cambridge, Mass. Harvard Uniersity.

Rosen, Harold and Burgess, Tony. (1980) Languages and Dialects of London School Children: an investigation. Ward Lock Educational.

Rudensky, Maria. (1983) Federal Education Programs Aid Refugee Children. Momentum, Journal of the National Catholic Education Association. (Vol. 14, No. 1, Feb. 1983, ppo. 22-27.) Washington, D.C. National Catholic Education Association.

Terrell, Tracy D. (1981) The National Approach in Bilingual Education. Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Approach. Los Angeles, Calif. Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Wilding, Jenny. (1981) Minority Languages in the Classroom: a survey of Asian parents in Leicester. Leicester City Council/Leicester Council for Community Relations.

1301D